

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested for claims 1-6.

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 639 686 (EP '686) in view of EP 1 075 917 (EP '917).

Claim 1, as amended, from which claims 2-6 depend, defines a magnet arrangement for fastening a concrete mould side to a casting bed, comprising a magnet unit having body having at least one front face and a downwardly facing wedge recess for receiving an upwardly facing wedge on a mould side, and a magnet fixed in the body for attaching the unit to a metallic casting bed. The arrangement also includes a detaching tool for tilting the body relative to the casting bed about an axis substantially perpendicular to the front face.

The magnet arrangement of claim 1 offers various advantages, including providing a simple arrangement for fastening a concrete mould side to a casting bed and for later removing the magnet unit from the mould side.

EP '686 appears to disclose that the magnet 6 secures a mould 4 by virtue of the magnet being U-shaped such that grip ridges 15 on the inside of the mould clamp around the magnet. A longitudinal axis of the magnet 6 appears to extend along the side of the mould 4. It appears that when it is desired to move the magnet 6 relative to the casting bed, the magnet is tilted around an axis parallel to its longitudinal axis by an arm arrangement 13 with a clamping member 14 that clamps around the magnet.

EP '917 is cited as disclosing a magnet unit with a wedge arrangement 7, 11 as claimed. EP '917 discloses that the magnet unit 20 has a number of moving parts and is

removed from the mould by turning a release lever that moves a tiltable part 3 in which the magnet is disposed so that the magnet is lifted from the casting bed. The tiltable part 3 tilts about an axis that is parallel to a plane of a front face of the magnet unit.

None of the cited documents discloses or suggests the claimed combination of features including a detaching tool for tilting the body relative to the casting bed about an axis substantially perpendicular to the front face.

In view of the differences between claim 1 and the cited references, and further in view of the advantages available through the claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom define patentably over the cited references.

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP '686 in view of EP '917 and U.S. Patent No. 6,082,701 to *Reymann*. *Reymann* is cited only for its disclosure of a magnet unit having opposite sides configured to support separate mould sides. *Reymann* cures none of the defects of EP '686 and EP '917 discussed above with regard to claim 1 and, for at least that reason, claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom, including claims 2-3 and 5-6, define patentably over the cited combination of documents.

Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill would not have combined *Reymann* with EP '686 or EP '917 at least because to do so would make it impossible to remove the magnet unit. Both EP '686 or EP '917 contemplate that the magnet unit will be tilted about an axis parallel to a front face of the unit, i.e., in the longitudinal direction of the mould side. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have

known how to adapt the structures in EP '686 or EP '917 to remove magnet units when two mould sides are clamped. The inability to remove the magnet units would, of course, make them inoperable for their intended function.

In view of the differences between claims 2-3 and 5-6 and EP '686 in view of EP '917 and *Reymann*, and further in view of the advantages available through the claimed invention, and further in view of the fact that modification of EP '686 or EP '917 in view of *Reymann* would destroy EP '686 or EP '917 for their intended function, it is respectfully submitted that those claims define patentably over the cited references.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, claims 1-6, are in condition for allowance. Allowance is cordially urged.

If the Examiner should be of the opinion that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: Sept 5, 2003

By: 
Harold R. Brown III
Registration No. 36,341

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620